



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,014	11/03/2003	Masakazu Nakamura	3712174-00459	3703
29175	7590	08/30/2011		
K&L Gates LLP P. O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690			EXAMINER ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K	
			ART UNIT 3628	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 08/30/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

10/700,014

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

AKIBA ROBINSON BOYCE

Art Unit

3628

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 May 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 29-35, 62 and 64.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As per claim 29, applicant argues that "Takayama's service providing means (i. e. Lewis's main computer system 158 and the alleged "electronic ticket platform center") that supplies the ticket to the second electronic wallet does not delete the ticket from the first electronic wallet. Instead, the second electronic wallet sends the ticket receipt to the first electronic wallet causing the first electronic wallet to delete the ticket. 'Thus, Takayama's deletion process is independent of the service providing means.'" However, examiner disagrees. In Takayama, as shown in [0237], since the service providing means must perform a validation process in order for the electronic wallet to even consider handling of processes involved with an electronic payment card, it is therefore suggested that the service providing means facilitates processes involved with the electronic wallet, including the deletion of the electronic payment card from an electronic wallet. As per claim 64, applicant argues that "The ID and password allegedly within the network-linked electronic ticket is unrelated to "identification information of a second storage chip" that the ticket is to be transferred to as claimed. Likewise, applying Sasaki's user ID and password does not suggest that the person who already has the ticket specifies a password "for writing the at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets into the second information storage chip" as claimed. The password Sasaki discloses merely relates to a password associated with a user ID used to authenticate a user when logging into a network service provider. However, examiner disagrees. Examiner interprets that since Sasaki discloses that the electronic ticket contains a "certificate" describing identification information so a user need not enter the ID or password each time, this suggests that a user ID and password is associated with processes involved concerning the electronic ticket, and therefore, when Sasaki discloses that the electronic ticket information includes data concerning whether or not the electronic ticket can be transferred to another person, this suggests that the above mentioned user ID and password is associated with the process of transferring the electronic ticket to another person and is therefore obvious that the user ID and password associated with the electronic ticket certificate when transferring the electronic ticket to another person suggests that the person who already has the ticket specifies a password "for writing the at least one of the plurality of electronic tickets into the second information storage chip" as claimed.